

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# CAI CENTER

## TECH MEMO

A HISTORY OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL  
PROGRAM OF VARYING FAMILIARITY  
TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sigmund Tobias

Tech Memo No. 43  
February 1, 1972

Project NR 154-280  
Sponsored by  
Personnel & Training Research Programs  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia  
Contract No. N00014-68-A-0494

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose  
of the United States Government.

# FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

ED 066014

W 010 087

## Tech Memo Series

The FSU-CAI Center Tech Memo Series is intended to provide communication to other colleagues and interested professionals who are actively utilizing computers in their research. The rationale for the Tech Memo Series is three-fold. First, pilot studies that show great promise and will eventuate in research reports can be given a quick distribution. Secondly, speeches given at professional meetings can be distributed for broad review and reaction. Third, the Tech Memo Series provides for distribution of pre-publication copies of research and implementation studies that after proper technical review will ultimately be found in professional journals.

In terms of substance, these reports will be concise, descriptive, and exploratory in nature. While cast within a CAI research model, a number of the reports will deal with technical implementation topics related to computers and their language or operating systems. Thus, we here at FSU trust this Tech Memo Series will serve a useful service and communication for other workers in the area of computers and education. Any comments to the authors can be forwarded via the Florida State University CAI Center.

Duncan N. Hansen  
Director  
CAI Center

Security Classification		
DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D (Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Florida State University Computer-Assisted Instruction Tallahassee, Florida 32306	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	2b. GROUP
3. REPORT TITLE A History of an Individualized Instructional Program of Varying Familiarity to College Students		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Tech Memo No. 43, February 1, 1972		
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) Sigmund Tobias		
6. REPORT DATE February 1, 1972	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 15	7b. NO. OF REFS 18
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. N00014-68-A-0494	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
b. PROJECT NO. NR 154-280	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
c.		
d.		
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Personnel & Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research Arlington, Virginia	
13. ABSTRACT The present memorandum has described the evolution of a set of individualized instructional materials dealing with subject matter of varying familiarity to college students. The materials have been widely used by a number of investigators. In their full version, these materials contained content with which subjects have a fair amount of prior familiarity, and materials with which college-age students have been shown to have no prior experience. The materials have been used in both a programmed and computer-assisted instructional format. The types of modification made to the program by different investigators can, in part, account for some discrepancy between research findings. It is, therefore, strongly suggested that future researchers using these materials explicitly describe modifications made to the program.		

DD FORM 1473  
1 NOV 65  
S/N 0101-807-6811

(PAGE 1)

Security Classification  
A-31408

14.	KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
		ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT

(BACK)

Security Classification  
A-31409

A HISTORY OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL  
PROGRAM OF VARYING FAMILIARITY  
TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sigmund Tobias

Tech Memo No. 43  
February 1, 1972

Project NR 154-280  
Sponsored by  
Personnel & Training Research Programs  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, Virginia  
Contract No. N00014-68-A-0494

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose  
of the United States Government.

A HISTORY OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL  
PROGRAM OF VARYING FAMILIARITY  
TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sigmund Tobias  
Florida State University

ABSTRACT

The present memorandum has described the evolution of a set of individualized instructional materials dealing with subject matter of varying familiarity to college students. The materials have been widely used by a number of investigators. In their full version, these materials contained content with which subjects have a fair amount of prior familiarity, and materials with which college-age students have been shown to have no prior experience. The materials have been used in both a programmed and computer-assisted instructional format. The types of modification made to the program by different investigators can, in part, account for some discrepancy between research findings. It is, therefore, strongly suggested that future researchers using these materials explicitly describe modifications made to the program.

A History of an Individualized Instructional  
Program of Varying Familiarity  
to College Students

Introduction

This report summarizes the evolution of a set of widely-used individualized instructional materials, and the modifications made to them. The development of a science of instruction demands the presence of well-standardized instructional materials to be used for research purposes. Since research is most easily conducted with a college population, it becomes important to develop programs especially applicable to college students. One of the problems encountered in such a population is that there is a good deal of previous familiarity with most topics. The college student has had twelve years of formal education in the primary and secondary schools, in addition to exposure to a wide range of subject matter in the media. Thus, it is difficult to present college students with meaningful, verbal instructional material with which they have little prior experience. If materials of substantial prior familiarity to students are used in instructional research, the problem always arises whether the data obtained are attributable to the student's previous experience with the area, or to the instructional manipulations. Another question arising is, are the results of instructional research different when subjects have had, or not had, prior experience with the content? It is the purpose of this report to detail the development of a set of instructional material to

facilitate studies such as these alluded to above. It is further intended to relate some of the data gained from the use of these materials at different universities to the modification made on the materials.

The materials are available in two major formats: a programmed instruction booklet in which the materials are presented via paper and pencil; and a format suitable for presentation via computer-assisted instruction (CAI). The CAI version was written in Coursewriter II, and intended for presentation on a system with graphics capability like the IBM 1500 instructional system.

The instructional program can be separated into two parts. The first of these has become known as the technical, unfamiliar section of the program. It deals with the diagnosis of myocardial infarction by means of electrocardiographic tracings taken from the fifth precordial lead of the electrocardiogram. This portion of the program uses the technical terminology dealing with the severity of heart disease, different degrees of coronary damage, their reversability, and stages in the healing cycle of recovery from heart disease. The material requires two types of answers: (a) verbal responses which frequently involve technical medical terminology dealing with heart disease; (b) graphic, or pictorial responses requiring drawing of the types of ECG tracings characteristic of various levels of heart disease, and a graphic representation of the type and severity of damage done to the heart muscle.

A nontechnical, familiar section of 55 frames was developed subsequently. This portion of the instructional material, usually



appearing as the first 55 frames of the program, consists of material dealing with the incidence and prevalence of heart disease, and of fatalities resulting from coronary attacks. This section covers, in nontechnical language, various risk factors with respect to contracting heart disease such as smoking, cholesterol, tension, and lack of exercise. In conception this program deals in a systematic manner with material on heart disease which is widely available in the public media.

The diagnosis of myocardial infarction was initially developed as a demonstration of programmed instruction by Francis Mechner (undated). This edition of the program will be referred to as Version I. Version I was subsequently employed by Cummings and Goldstein (1964) in a study comparing the effectiveness of overt and covert responding to programmed materials. That edition of the program consisted of 117 frames presented in booklet format with a frame appearing on one page, and the confirmation for the response in the left-hand margin of the next page. Students recorded their answers on an accompanying answer sheet. Version I of the program was also employed by Oppenheim (1965) in his study dealing response modes to programmed instruction. Holland (1967) found this version to be highly satisfactory in terms of requiring responses which were contingent upon the detailed inspection of content introduced in each frame, i.e., with respect to blackout ratio. Holland and Kemp (1965), and Kemp and Holland (1966) report a low blackout ratio for this version of the program, indicating that only small portions of frames could be blacked out without affecting program error rate. Holland (1967), and Anderson (1967) described the blackout

ratio as an effective index of the quality of programmed instructional materials, and in these terms the myocardial infarction materials were viewed as efficient exemplars of the programmed instructional format.

Major modifications to these materials were made in a study of the effects of creativity, response modes, and subject matter familiarity on achievement in programmed instruction (Tobias, 1968). These changes were of two types: (a) a revision of the technical materials; and (b) preparation of a new set of familiar materials. The technical material was modified in several important respects. Previous research had indicated an unusually high error rate for these materials. Content analysis of a preliminary tryout indicated that the sequence of the program and the clarity of various sections could be improved. Following tryout, revision, and pilot testing the 117 frames of the original material were reduced to a total of 89 frames which covered all of the content dealt with in the previous version. An original program of 55 frames dealing with relatively nontechnical subject matter was also developed at this point and tried out. Data gathered at this stage indicated that pretest scores for the familiar material in a college population approached 33 percent, whereas pretest scores for the technical material were virtually zero, that is, subjects typically gave up on the pretest indicating: "I don't know anything about this." This edition of the program will be referred to as Version II. Version II was employed in a subsequent series of studies dealing with the effects of different variables on achievement from programmed instruction. (Tobias, 1969, 1972; Tobias & Abramson, 1971).

The familiar section of the program was originally developed for a population of college students. In order to utilize this section of the material with a high school student population, this section of the program was changed by Shanstrom (1972). This modification is referred to as Version IIa and was intended to reduce the difficulty of the vocabulary level throughout the program. For example, "fatty substances in the blood," was changed to "bits of fat in the blood." Similarly, complex sentences were rewritten into simpler and shorter units. The content of the program was, however, unchanged.

Version II and IIa were administered in a booklet format. Frames appeared on one page, and the feedback for the responses to one frame typically appeared in the left hand margin of the next page, accompanied by the next frame. These were called the constructed response formats. Reading formats for Versions II and IIa were prepared by filling in response blanks and rewording question frames into declaratory statements. The reading versions did not require overt response of any kind. A no-reinforcement format of Version II was prepared for one study (Tobias & Abramson, 1971); this version was identical to the constructed response format, except that the feedback portion of the material had been eliminated. In another study (Tobias, 1972) the constructed response frame sequence had been reordered by means of a table of random numbers to create a random order for a study of the effects of sequence.

The results of investigations using these materials in a programmed format were quite consistent. In all of the studies in which the program was used, constructing responses and receiving reinforcement

for them resulted in superior achievement compared to other response modes, for the technical, unfamiliar subject matter. It was also shown (Tobias, 1972) that for this subject matter, scrambling the frame sequence resulted in significantly lower achievement compared to working the program in its logical sequence. On the other hand, for the familiar section of the program, no achievement differences have ever been reported favoring one response mode over another, nor did scrambling this subject matter affect the achievement negatively. These results have been interpreted (Tobias, 1969; Tobias & Abramson, 1971; Tobias, 1972) as indicating that optimal instructional method was probably modified by the subject's prior familiarity with the body of subject matter.

#### CAI Version

The materials developed in Version II were prepared for presentation on the IBM 1500 CAI system for utilization in a series of studies at the FSU CAI Center. Initially, an attempt was made to duplicate the programmed instruction version as closely as possible. Since the original program called for extensive graphic, or pictorial responses in which subjects drew ECG tracings characteristic of different types of heart disease, and of graphic representations of the type and extent of damage to the heart muscle, these procedures had to be changed for the CAI presentation. Subjects were presented with a xerographed handout in which each of the elements of different ECG tracings had been broken down into a series of discrete shapes. Each shape in turn was associated with a particular number. When the student had to make a drawing on the

CAI system, he typed in the number representing a particular shape and the shape then appeared on the cathode ray screen.

With the exception of this modification, the CAI materials were identical to Version II. On the constructed response program of this edition, students made all their responses to a frame at once. After responses were entered into the system, the correct answer was flashed onto the CRT screen to be followed by the next frame. This edition of the materials will be referred to as Version III.

Version III of the instructional materials was used by Leherissey, O'Neil, and Hansen (1971). The data with respect to achievement from different response modes failed to replicate Tobias' (1968, 1969; Tobias & Abramson, 1971) findings that the constructed response mode led to superior achievement on the technical material. Prior findings that there were no differences among response modes on the familiar material were replicated. The data suggested that this version of the instructional materials needed modification. Subjects in the constructed response mode verbalized considerable hostility towards the materials, in addition to which the mean amount of time required by the constructed response mode on the CAI system was approximately 20 minutes longer than required by similar students utilizing the programmed format (Version II).

In a further study (Leherissey, O'Neil, Heinrich, & Hansen, 1971), the technical portion of Version III was prepared in two forms, a short (Version IIIa) and a long form. The shortening of the technical materials did not succeed in replicating Tobias' findings regarding the superiority

of the constructed response mode. A detailed job analysis of the instructional task faced by students revealed one major problem. In the constructed response format of Version III, subjects were required to construct ECG tracings by typing out numbers with which the elements of the ECG tracings had been associated on a xerograph sheet. The posttest was administered off the terminal, in a paper and pencil constructed response test. On the test subjects were required to actually draw the electrocardiograph tracings, which they had hitherto responded to only by indicating appropriate numbers. This difference in procedure suggested that the discrepancy among previous findings might be partially attributable to the difference in the task.

Leherissey (1971) modified this aspect of the procedure. Instead of requiring subjects to actually draw a tracing on posttest, they were asked to respond with the appropriate numbers which they had used to construct the tracing while working on the program. Leherissey's findings replicated those previously reported by Tobias in that the constructed response group achieved more on the technical program than did the reading group. The fact that these findings coincided with those reported when the instructional material was presented via programmed instruction suggested that Leherissey's procedures were more similar to those employed in the programmed mode.

#### Further CAI Modifications

A further analysis of the task confronted by subjects working on these materials on a CAI system compared to the programmed mode revealed another fundamental difference between the tasks. The materials frequently require responses of more than one word, that is, responses of

a phrase or so. In the programed mode, typically when a subject responded with a sentence and then flipped a page to look at the feedback, any phrase appearing in the reinforcement portion which was similar to his response was likely to be accepted as confirmation of the answer. On the CAI system, however, when subjects typed one phrase, and the system responded with an essentially similar phrase using different terms, subjects were less prone to accept this as confirmation of their response. The life-like quality of the CAI system and failure of the material to indicate that the subjects' response was equivalent to the pre-stored correct answer appeared to leave a considerable margin of doubt as to whether the response was, in fact, scored as correct. For these reasons, one major revision instituted in Version IV was that subjects' responses were scanned for the degree to which they compared to the pre-stored responses. Three types of feedback were provided:

1. That the response was correct and identical, or equivalent to the text book response which was then provided.
2. That the answer was generally correct, and the textbook response was then displayed.
3. That the answer was not quite right, and then the textbook response was presented.

It had also been noted that on many frames subjects had to provide several responses. In the previous versions the feedback had generally been supplied for all responses to a frame at one time. This appeared to leave some room for confusion with respect to the accuracy of each individual answer. In the present modification responses were

generally processed sequentially. Thus, the subject was typically informed about the accuracy of one response before making the next one. When the first response set to a particular frame had been processed, it was maintained on the screen while the subject continued to work on the material presented and responses required in the latter half of the frame.

The presentation and processing of the responses dealing with ECG tracings, and drawings representing different degrees of damage to the heart muscle were also changed. For the tracings, a paper insert was prepared showing both the number and the segment of the curve it represented. This insert was placed immediately above the first row of typewriter keys below the CRT, and was always in the subjects' view. Also, responses involving tracings were scored, and the feedback outlined above for textual responses was also presented for the graphic answers, together with the correct answer.

In Version III the subject represented the type of damage to the heart muscle by selecting from four choices flashed on the right side of the screen. Since in this case it also appeared possible that the subject might not be fully aware how close his response was to the standard, this procedure was also modified by providing feedback regarding the accuracy of response. In the graphic responses, as in the verbal responses, an attempt was made to split complex frames into component parts, and process them sequentially so that feedback was generally given for one response prior to making the second.

In Version III it was noted that the processing of the constructed response format required substantially more time than had been



true for the same group in the programmed booklet format. Therefore, the program was shortened for Version IV by eliminating both the familiar section of the material, and a part of the content dealing with the healing cycle (frames 127-143 in the original program booklet). A further modification instituted for Version IV was to rewrite that part of the posttest dealing with the healing cycle to reflect the shortened treatment of that area in Version IV. Finally, the new technical posttest was presented via terminal, instead of via paper and pencil as had been the case in previous versions. Version IV of the program was prepared in both a reading and constructed response format. In an attempt to study the effects of scrambling, and objectives on achievement from CAI, the sequence of frames in Version IV was changed by means of a table of random numbers, giving rise to IVa.

Two studies were run on Version IV of the instructional materials (Tobias, 1972b; Tobias & Duchastel, 1972). The first of these investigations studied the effects of distraction and response mode on achievement from CAI. In that study the group making constructed responses with reinforcement achieved significantly more than did the reading group. In the second investigation (Tobias & Duchastel, 1972), a comparison was made between a scrambled and a regular sequence group. The results indicated that the scrambled group achieved significantly less than did the regular sequence group. These data suggest that the failure to replicate earlier findings in previous CAI versions may have been attributable to the way the program was arranged. Apparently, in an attempt to replicate the programmed format most closely, the essential difference between the

CAI medium and the programmed format resulted in making the materials different, rather than more similar. Therefore, it is suggested that future researchers describe their procedures and modifications made to existing materials most carefully. It is apparently possible for results from instructional programs to be strongly affected by minor variations in the instruction material.

Another CAI version of this program was prepared at the University of Illinois for presentation on the PLATO CAI system. This version was not available for inspection for this memorandum, but is described in a study on feedback procedures and programmed instruction by Anderson, Kulhavy, and Andre (1971). This version apparently contained the total program (Version II) less 36 frames of the familiar material. In the Illinois version, subjects were not asked to construct drawings of any kind. Anderson also modified the posttest to eliminate questions requiring drawings, and included some multiple-choice items.

### Summary

The present memorandum has described the development of a set of instructional materials dealing with heart disease which have been widely used by a number of investigators. In their full version, these materials contained both content with which subjects have a fair amount of prior familiarity, and materials with which college-age students have been shown to be relatively unfamiliar. The materials have been used in both the programmed, and computer-assisted instructional format. The types of modification made to the program by different investigators

can, in part, account for some discrepancy between research findings. It is, therefore, strongly suggested that future researchers using these materials explicitly describe modifications made to the program.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. C. Educational psychology. Annual Review of Psychology 1967, 18, 103-164.
- Anderson, R. C., Kulhavy, R. W., & Andre, T. Feedback procedures in programmed instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1971, 62, 148-156.
- Cummings, A., & Goldstein, L. The effect of overt and covert responding on two kinds of learning tasks. In J. P. DeCecco (Ed.) Educational Technology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.
- Holland, J. G. A quantitative measure for programmed instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 1967, 4, 87-101.
- Holland, J. G., & Kemp, F. D. A measure of programming in teaching machine material. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 5, 264-269.
- Kemp, F. D., & Holland, J. G. Blackout ratio and overt responses in programmed instruction: Resolution of disparate results. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, 109-114
- Leherissey, B. L. The effects of stimulating state epistemic curiosity on state anxiety and performance in a complex computer-assisted learning task. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1971.
- Leherissey, B. L., O'Neil, H. F., & Hansen, D. N. Effect of anxiety, response mode, and subject matter familiarity on achievement in CAI learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the AERA, New York, February 1971. (Not yet released; also Tech Memo 41).
- Leherissey, B. L., O'Neil, H. F., Heinrich, D., & Hansen, D. N. Effect of anxiety, response mode, subject matter familiarity, and learning times on achievement in computer-assisted learning. Paper presented at the meeting of APA, Washington, D.C., September 1971.
- Mechner, F. Diagnosis of myocardial infarction. Undated.
- Oppenheim, D. B. The relation between intelligence and different patterns of feedback in a linear teaching program. Paper read at American Educational Research Association Convention, Chicago, February 1965.

- Shanstrom, E. The effect of response mode and subject matter familiarity on achievement from programed instruction. Graduate Research in Education and Related Disciplines, In press.
- Tobias, S. The effect of sequence and familiarity with subject matter on achievement from programmed instruction. Paper read at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill., April 1972.
- Tobias, S. Distraction and programed instruction. Technical Report No. 2. Programed Instruction Research Project. New York: City College of N.Y., 1969.
- Tobias, S. The effect of creativity, response mode, and subject matter familiarity on achievement from programmed instruction. New York: MSS Publishing Co., 1968.
- Tobias, S., & Abramson, T. Interaction among anxiety response mode, and familiarity of subject matter on achievement from programmed instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1971, 62, 357-364.
- Tobias, S. Distraction and response mode in computer-assisted instruction (In preparation).
- Tobias, S., & Duchastel, P. Objectives and sequence in computer-assisted instruction (In preparation).

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

### NAVY

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>4 Director, Personnel and Training<br/>Research Programs<br/>Office of Naval Research<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p>  | <p>6 Director<br/>Naval Research Laboratory<br/>Washington, DC 20390<br/>ATTN: Library, Code 2029 (ONRL)</p>                          |
| <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>495 Summer Street<br/>Boston, MA 02210</p>  | <p>6 Director<br/>Navy Research Laboratory<br/>Washington, DC 20390<br/>ATTN: Technical Information Div.</p>                          |
| <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>1030 East Green Street<br/>Pasadena, CA 91101</p>   | <p>12 Defense Documentation Center<br/>Cameron Station, Building 5<br/>5010 Duke Street<br/>Alexandria, VA 22314</p>                  |
| <p>1 Director<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>536 South Clark Street<br/>Chicago, IL 60605</p>  | <p>1 Behavioral Sciences Department<br/>Naval Medical Research Institute<br/>National Naval Medical Center<br/>Bethesda, MD 20014</p> |
| <p>1 Commander<br/>Operational Test and Evaluation Force<br/>U.S. Naval Base<br/>Norfolk, VA 23511</p>  | <p>1 Chief<br/>Bureau of Medicine and Surgery<br/>Code 513<br/>Washington, DC 20390</p>   |
| <p>1 Capt. Ouida C. Upchurch, NC, USN<br/>BUMED Program Coordinator for<br/>Education and Training R &amp; D<br/>BLDG 142, Nat'l Naval Medical Ctr<br/>Bethesda, Maryland 20014</p> | <p>1 Commanding Officer<br/>Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric<br/>Research Unit<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p>                              |
| <p>1 Technical Reference Library<br/>Naval Medical Research Institute<br/>National Naval Medical Center<br/>Bethesda, MD 20014</p>  | <p>1 Chief of Naval Operations (OP-98)<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20350<br/>ATTN: Dr. J. J. Collins</p>            |
| <p>1 Chief of Naval Training<br/>Naval Air Station<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508<br/>ATTN: Capt. Allen E. McMichael (A11)</p>   | <p>2 Technical Director<br/>Personnel Research Division<br/>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br/>Washington, DC 20370</p>                    |
| <p>1 Mr. S. Friedman<br/>Special Assistant for Research<br/>&amp; Studies<br/>OASN (M&amp;RA)<br/>The Pentagon, Room 4E794<br/>Washington, DC 20350</p>                             | <p>2 Technical Library (Pers-11B)<br/>Bureau of Naval Personnel<br/>Department of the Navy<br/>Washington, DC 20360</p>               |
|   | <p>1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN<br/>COMFAIRMIRAMAR F-14<br/>NAS Miramar, CA 92145</p>   |

- 1 Chief, Naval Air Reserve Training  
Naval Air Station  
Box 1  
Glenview, IL 60026
- 1 Chief  
Naval Air Technical Training  
Naval Air Station  
Memphis, TN 38115
- 1 Commander, Naval Air Systems  
Command  
Navy Department, AIR-413C  
Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Commanding Officer  
Naval Air Technical Training Center  
Jacksonville, FL 32213
- 1 Chief of Naval Air Training  
Code 017  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 Research Director, Code 06  
Research and Evaluation Dept.  
U.S. Naval Examining Center  
Building 2711 - Green Bay Area  
Great Lakes, IL 60088  
ATTN: C.S. Winiewicz
- 1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr., MSC USN  
CSOT  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, PA 18974
- 1 Technical Library  
Naval Ordnance Station  
Indian Head, MD 20640
- 1 Mr. George N. Graine  
Naval Ship Systems Command (SHIP 03H)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20360
- 1 Technical Library  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
National Center, Building 3 Room 3  
S-08  
Washington, D.C. 20360
- 1 Technical Director  
Naval Personnel Research and  
Development Laboratory  
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 200  
Washington, DC 20390
- 3 Commanding Officer  
Naval Personnel and Training  
Research Laboratory  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Chairman  
Behavioral Science Department  
Naval Command and Management Div.  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Luce Hall  
Annapolis, MD 21402
- 1 Superintendent  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940  
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)
- 1 Information Systems Programs  
Code 437  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 Commanding Officer  
Service School Command  
U.S. Naval Training Center  
San Diego, CA 92133
- 1 Dr. James J. Regan, Code 55  
Naval Training Device Center  
Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 Commander  
Submarine Development Group Two  
Fleet Post Office  
New York, NY 09501
- 1 Lee Miller  
NAVAIRSYSCOM AIR 413E  
5600 Columbia Pike  
Falls Church, VA

1 Col. George Caridakis  
Director, Office of Manpower  
Utilization  
Headquarters, Marine Corps (A01H)  
MCB  
Quantico, VA 22134

1 Col. James Marsh, USMC  
Headquarters Marine Corps (A01M)  
Washington, DC 20380 (12345)

1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code AX)  
Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Washington, D.C. 20380

#### ARMY

1 Behavioral Sciences Division  
Office of Chief of Research and  
Development  
Department of the Army  
Washington, D.C. 20310

1 U.S. Army Behavior and Systems  
Research Laboratory  
Commonwealth Building, Room 239  
1320 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Director of Research  
US Army Armor Human Research Unit  
ATTN: Library  
Bldg 2422 Morande Street  
Fort Knox, KY 40121

1 Commandant  
U.S. Army Adjutant General School  
Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216  
ATTN: ATSAG-EA

1 Director  
Behavioral Sciences Laboratory  
U.S. Army Research Institute of  
Environmental Medicine  
Natick, MA 01760

1 Division of Neuropsychiatry  
Walter Reed Army Institute of  
Research  
Walter Reed Army Medical Center  
Washington, D.C. 20012

1 Armed Forces Staff College  
Norfolk, VA 23511  
ATTN: Library

1 Dr. George S. Harker, Director  
Experimental Psychology Division  
U.S. Army Medical Research Lab.  
Fort Knox, KY 40121

#### AIR FORCE

1 AFHRL (TR/Dr. G. A. Eckstrand)  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Ohio 45433

1 AFHPL (TRT/Dr. Ross L. Morgan)  
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Ohio 45433

1 AFHRL (MD)  
701 Prince Street  
Room 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 AFSOR (NL)  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Lt. Col. Robert R. Gerry, USAF  
Chief, Instructional Technology  
Programs  
Resources & Technology Division  
(DPTBD DCS/P)  
The Pentagon (Room 4C244)  
Washington, D.C. 20330

1 HQ, AFSC (SDEC)  
Andrews Air Force Base  
Washington, D.C. 20330

1 Personnel Research Division  
(AFHRL)  
Lackland Air Force Base  
San Antonio, TX 78236



1 Director  
Air University Library (AUL-8110)  
Maxwell Air Force Base,  
Alabama, 36112

1 Headquarters, Electronics Systems  
Division  
ATTN: Dr. Sylvia Mayer/MCDS  
L.G. Hanscom Field  
Bedford, MA 01730

1 Commandant  
U.S. Air Force School of  
Aerospace Medicine  
ATTN: Aeromedical Library  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

DOD

1 William J. Stormer  
DOD Computer Institute  
Washington Navy Yard, Bldg. 175  
Washington, DC 20390

1 Director of Manpower Research  
OASD (M&RA) (M&RU)  
Room 3D960  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C.

OTHER GOVERNMENT

1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief  
Psychological Research Branch (P-1)  
U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20591

1 Dr. Alvin E. Goins, Chief  
Personality and Cognition Research  
Section  
Behavioral Sciences Research Branch  
National Institute of Mental Health  
5454 Wisconsin Ave., Room 10A01  
Washington, D.C.

1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Computer Innovation in Education  
Section  
Office of Computing Activities  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, D.C. 20550

MISCELLANEOUS

1 Dr. John Annett  
Department of Psychology  
Hull University  
Hull  
Yorkshire, England

1 Dr. David Weiss  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Psychology  
Elliot Hall  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson  
Department of Psychology  
Stanford University

1 ERIC Clearinghouse on  
Educational Media and Technology  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass  
University of Rochester  
Management Research Center  
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Dr. Lee R. Beach  
Department of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105

- 1 ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational  
and Technical Education  
The Ohio State University  
1900 Kenny Road  
Columbus, OH 43210  
ATTN: Acquisition Specialist
- 1 Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc.  
2001 "S" St. N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037
- 1 Human Resources Research Organization  
Division #3  
Post Office Box 5787  
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Robert Glaser  
Learning Research and Development  
Center  
University of Pittsburgh 15213  
Pittsburgh, PA
- 1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman  
American Institutes for Research  
8555 Sixteenth Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20910
- 1 Dr. Bert Green  
Department of Psychology  
Johns Hopkins University  
Baltimore, MD 21218
- 1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch  
Decision Systems Associates, Inc.  
11428 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852
- 1 Dr. M. D. Havron  
Human Sciences Research, Inc.  
Westgate Industrial Park  
7710 Old Springhouse Road  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Office of Computer Information  
Center for Computer Sciences and  
Technology  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, D.C. 20234
- 1 Dr. Ellsworth C. Hall  
Co-Director, Manpower Laboratory  
Colorado State University  
50 West Fifth Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80204
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Library  
300 North Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #4, Infantry  
Post Office Box 2086  
Fort Benning, Georgia 31905
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #5, Air Defense  
Post Office Box 6021  
Fort Bliss, TX 77916
- 1 Human Resources Research  
Organization  
Division #6, Aviation (Library)  
Post Office Box 428  
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360
- 1 Dr. Roger A. Kaufman  
Graduate School of Human Behavior  
U.S. International University  
8655 E. Pomerada Road  
San Diego, CA 92124
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
Santa Barbara Research Park  
6780 Cortona Drive  
Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Benton J. Underwood  
Department of Psychology  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, IL 60201

- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrollo  
2431 North Edgewood Street  
Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Psychological Abstracts  
American Psychological Association  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036
- 1 Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee  
R-K Research & System Design  
3947 Ridgmont Drive  
Malibu, CA 90265
- 1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney  
Behavioral Technology Laboratories  
University of Southern California  
University Park  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Len Rosenbaum  
Psychology Department  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Robert J. Seidel  
Human Resources Research Organization  
300 N. Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Prof. Gerald L. Thompson  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Graduate School of Industrial  
Administration  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Jaime Carbonell  
Bolt, Bernanek and Newman  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Mr. C. R. Vest  
6225 Nelway Drive  
McLean, Virginia 22101
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Mr. Richard S. Kneisel  
Special Assistant -  
Educational Advisor  
Department of the Army  
United States Army Infantry School  
Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 Dr. Scarvia Anderson  
Executive Director for  
Special Dev.  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. George E. Rowland  
Rowland and Company, Inc.  
Post Office Box 61  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
- 1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel  
Applied Psychological Services  
Science Center  
404 East Lancaster Avenue  
Wayne, PA 19087
- 1 Dr. Mats Bjorkman  
University of Umea  
Department of Psychology  
Umea 6, Sweden